G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—20 12-13

1902

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

19D.

(Police.)

File No. 3 of 02. ~~33 and 37~~

Serial Nos. 33 and 37

~~Papers Filed.~~

Month _____

SUBJECT.

Prosecution under the Infant Mc Prevention Regulation

T. V. Ramadurgacary Iyer

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
Commenced	

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

SECTION Pol (REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS).

FILE No. 3.9.3.9

SERIAL No.

(Full Office Note.)

Subject. Infant marriage.

Letter No. 6940/416 dated 30th May 1903 from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, recommending the prosecution of the parties concerned in an infant marriage that *took place at Korthagere Chikanpur Taluk on 10th June 1901.

Note sheet

From the Inspector General's report it will be observed that the marriage took place at Korthagere Chikanpur Taluk on the 10th June 1901 i.e. 2 years ago. ~~The age of the girl~~ No explanation has been furnished as to the cause of the delay. The records show that the Patel of the village submitted a report of the occurrence to the Police Jemadar of Sira-Koppa on 14th June 1901, i.e., 4 days after the occurrence that the Chikanpur Police Subu

Why should he be not asked to furnish it? No papers should be sent up simply. When an explanation

* 1. Statement of case in narrative form in regular sequence of subject matter or date.
2. Opinions to be stated only as supported by precedents, or general rules which should always be quoted.
3. Serial numbers in file, &c., to be always stated.
4. Dates of important documents referred should be given.
5. Write on both sides, leaving the same side as margin.

† 1. No. and date of latest letter or paper.
2. Catch words to show nature of subject.
3. Subject to be in red and body of note in black ink.

submitted the case to the Dt
Police Office on 11-8-02 i.e.
more than a year after
the report:

The age of the bride on
the day of marriage is reported
to be have been 6 years & 23
days

Draft annexure, the prose-
cution of the parties concerned
is submitted for orders.

6/6/03 A prosecution at the
late date, two years after the
marriage, & when the bride has ceased
to be an "infant," cannot, ~~in my~~
~~opinion~~ prove deterrent, especially
as the principal offender, the bride's
father, is to be left out as being a
resident of British territory; a
prosecution under these circumstances seems
unexpedient. May an order declining
sanction be passed, and an explanation
called for as regards the inordinate
delay in making this report, as well as
the names of the Officers responsible
for it?

6.6.03

Please draft a note
to your view. The D.G. may
be asked to take due notice
of the delay.

7/6/03

~~Re Second Wife~~

That the girl has passed good
the age of 8 is no reason for
refusing to prosecute. Perhaps
this prosn may be declined on
the ground that the father is
out of our jurisdn. Draft
submitted for appl.

The Dewan

25/6/3

11077
25.6.03

Dy No. 12976
J. 25-51.

SECTION No. —

FILE No. 1902
33

From, L. Madiah Esq. RB
Inspector General of Police in
Mysore.

To, H.V. Nanjundayya Esq. Madras
Secretary to the Govt. of H. Highness
the Maharajah of Mysore.
General & Revenue Departments

Dated. 30th May 1903

No: 6960/— Cypher
Sir, 416. Secret

I have the honor to submit a memo and other records connected with the infant marriage of Gangavva aged about 6 years 11 months 23 days, daughter of Basalingappa g. Savi chan Caste at Kortagere Village Shikarpur Taluq, Shimoga District and to requisition sanction of Government for the prosecution of the parties concerned in the said marriage as noted overleaf.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Inspector General of Police

Encls

1.	Name of the bride	Gangavva
2.	" of the bridegroom	Gurappa
3.	of the bride's father	Basalingappa
4.	of the bridegroom's father	Yellinally Veerabasappa
5.	of any other party concerned in the marriage	Adriappa and Sangappa Purohits, Swabasappa, bin Eljappa and Halappa were present during the marriage.
6.	Age of the bride on the day of marriage	6 years and 23 days
7.	Age of the bridegroom on the day of marriage	About 15 years
8.	Date of marriage.	10th June 1901
9.	Names of the village & Taluk where the marriage took place	Korlagere, Shikarpur Tal Shimoga District.
10.	Records connected with the case.	one file as per Pheriste
11.	Persons recommended for prosecution	Veerabasappa and Evappa father and brother of the bridegroom and Adriappa the Purohit.
12.	Name of the officer recommending the prosecution under Section 3 of the Infant marriage prevention Regulation.	The Assistant Superintendent of Police Shimoga District
	Date of Report	9th May 1903.
	Recommendation made by the Inspector General of Police	The prosecution of the above persons may be sanctioned
	Any other remarks.	The father of the bride Basalingappa is a resident of the Koila Taluk in His Majesty's Territories and so his prosecution has not been recommended.

Read:—

Letter No. 6940/416 dated 30th May 1903 from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore reporting that on the 10th June 1901, an infant girl aged 6 years and 23 days named Gangavva, daughter of one Basavalingappa, was married to one Gurappa, son of Gettinally Veerabasappa at Kondagere, Chikanpur Taluk.

Order thereon:—

Govt consider that a prosecution at this late date, two years after the marriage, ~~and when~~ the

Copy to Pol.
No. 3 of 03
Sec. 37

12-13 8/17/03
J.73.03

the bride has ceased to be an infant. Cannot prove deterrent, especially as the principal offender, the brides father, is to be left and as being a resident in British territory; and therefore decline to sanction ~~the~~ it.

The Inspector General of Police, is requested to ~~furnish~~ from the Officer in charge ~~a~~ explanation ~~as regards~~ for the inordinate delay in making this report, & submit it for the orders of the Govt. ~~and to report the names of the officers responsible for the delay.~~

Secretary

To. The Inspector Genl of Police in Mysore returning records

Cannot be of much use as a deterrent

Mr Prinsep that the Govt General did not think it necessary to take action in the matter of such delays which have been more than once noted by Govt. The Officer responsible for this delay should deserves to be made an example of

Mund
26.VI.83